

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 17, 2015**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Waggoner, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Mike Nichols, Joe Palmquist

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Vanags, Planner; Steve Fischer, Manager

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Scott Waggoner at 7:56 p.m.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2015-01050, Station House Lofts

Description: 6-story mixed-use building consisting of 195 apartment units

Location: 16600 NE 79th Street

Applicant: Amber French *with* H+dIT Collaborative

Prior Review Date: 06/18/15

Staff Contact: Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426 or svanags@redmond.gov

Ms. Vanags noted that this was the second pre-application meeting for this project. This is a six-story mixed-use building downtown, off of 166th, adjacent to the YMCA. The applicant has some elevations to show the DRB and is asking for some clarifications from the DRB regarding its prior comments.

Rob Kiker with Weinstein AU, the project architects, presented on behalf of the applicant. Todd Bronk of the Berger Partnership, the landscape architects, was also present. Mr. Kiker thanked the DRB for its previous comments. He noted that the building would have a lantern effect on the 166th side, and that there would not be a commercial space in the lower level. The parcel is an aggregate of six different spots with an overall trapezoid shape. The site is in the Anderson Park neighborhood and is surrounded by other zones with similar five, six, seven, and eight-story heights. The design shows a courtyard building that fronts the street on all sides. The major pedestrian entries would be on 79th and 80th, and vehicular access to below grade parking is down in the southwest corner. Two levels of parking would be provided at a 0.97 ratio, which was approved by the Technical Committee.

The first level is two stories tall, and the applicant has proposed loft units along 166th and along 80th Street. A large amenity room would front onto the courtyard and a smaller amenity room, probably a fitness room, would front onto 80th. In the southeast corner is a lobby and rental office. The office and fitness room should mimic the look and feel of commercial spaces and should be a hub of activity. The upper floors, three through six, will have heavy indentations along 166th Avenue with the use of deep decks. This will provide modulation to the façade on this side. Open one-bedroom units are on the north and south end facing the courtyard. The distance between the ground floor terrace and the soffit above would be more than 17 feet high and the main block of the first story would sit back eight feet.

Todd Bronk, landscape architect, next spoke on behalf of the applicant. A garden streetscape helps transition from the residential units into Downtown. The streetscape and street trees will set the modulation of the decks and give the balconies shading in the summer and good sun absorption in the winter. The plan is to make this an environmentally friendly building. At both corners, the public will be

invited into the building with an open retail corner on both ends. At the last meeting, the DRB asked for more detail on the courtyard. The goal with the courtyard is to have an outdoor amenity space that is for all the residents. Some small intimate spaces have been provided as well.

Mr. Kiker presented again on behalf of the applicant and showed how its massing related to buildings surrounding it. He is hoping this project sets a precedent for other development in the area by using an open courtyard in the middle of the site. Cementitious panels with large vinyl windows would be used on the upper part of the building. The windows will be aggregated such that they come across more as a window wall. The balconies on the front of the project meet the minimal dimensions set by the City. At the base, there will be a storefront or curtain wall glazing system with high quality glass. Slab doors could be used with epoxy screens between them. The applicant wants to create a rhythm with the trees so they can grow up in the pockets created by the incisions in the building design.

The smaller one-bedroom units will have Juliet balconies. The deep recesses in the building are flush with the entry doors and help mark the entrances. The west façade has the courtyard in the middle and the opaque walls closest to the property line. The walls are eight feet from that line, and as such, window glazing is limited in those areas. Glazing is only provided into the bedroom windows. Real balconies are on two stacks of units, but Juliet balconies are on the one-bedroom units above the transfer slab. The applicant wants to bring the same language used on the front of the building around to the back, which is a curtain wall structure. The amenity space and smaller loft units front the courtyard. The applicant showed how trees would screen the units and the courtyard from the basketball courts adjacent to them.

The DRB asked the applicant to determine how the public and private space would interact. The wood decks from the loft units would be made of wood but then would wrap up into a screen in a single design move. This would be separated by a series of plantings, but the units would be able to take advantage of the courtyard element. This could create a family atmosphere with pocket spaces within the courtyard, which is an area that should have a lot of sun exposure. Plants such as vine maples will be grown in the courtyard to provide shade. The DRB had suggested at the last meeting that the applicant should color the backs of the insets between the bays, and the applicant is working on that idea with some colors or glazing that might fit. Also at the last meeting, some DRB members had suggested making a gradation or variation in color along the east façade, but other members had talked about creating crisp, white bays. The applicant has decided to make the bays clean and glassy and any colors would be used in the areas between the bays.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said this building will be great looking. Mr. Krueger liked the corner element and recessed decks, which provide some punch on the east elevation. He liked the crisp lines and modern look of the project.
- He asked about the loft homes along the streetscape, and noted they would not be live/work units. Mr. Krueger asked about how the privacy issues would be handled for these units.
- The applicant said the success of these units would depend on the steel railings on the units' balconies and the plantings outside the units. The height advantage of the terrace also offers some privacy. Also, these units are ten feet back from the edge, which could help as well.
- Mr. Krueger said that was his only question. Overall, he thinks the project is great.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said this was his first time seeing this project. Mr. Sutton asked about the hierarchy of paneling and which ones would be white and which would be gray, especially at the corners.
- The applicant said this was a white building with cutouts for the balconies. The panels are white and the only dark elements are the floor bands and the curtain wall of windows. The applicant said he used white panels because they are crisp-looking and will provide easier construction work. The plan is to isolate the panels such that they float within the apparent window wall.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the applicant had looked into using all-gray panels at the corners. The applicant said that option was investigated, but it gave the project a heavy look.

- Mr. Sutton said the massing is great. He said the interior courtyard seemed really flat and could use some depth.
- The applicant said the hope is not to hang over the courtyard with balconies, so the Juliet balconies were a good compromise as a way to animate the façade. Some real balconies in the floors above help to break up the massing. The applicant said the idea of the courtyard was to create a backdrop for all the landscaping.
- Mr. Sutton said this portion might look a little more tired than other parts of the building, but overall, the massing and the concept were very nice. Mr. Krueger asked him his opinions about the corners, and Mr. Sutton said he liked the way they looked.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said this was a strong project compared to other multi-family projects that come before the DRB. Mr. Waggoner said there was a lot of refined elegance in this project and the modulation of the massing is very striking.
- He said the white panels on the east side are a good way to go. He agreed that these panels provide a lightness and brightness that help make the building pop. He also liked the recessed decks and the use of glass near the decks.
- On the courtyard side, Mr. Waggoner liked the concept of providing family and individual spaces. He said the exercise room will help activate the space. He noted that the long side of the courtyard might be able to use some weather protection, as Mr. Sutton suggested, but said that units on this side do have a good lawn amenity.
- Mr. Waggoner liked the variation of balcony designs on the project, which provides rhythm and modulation without a lot of horizontal relief. He said the DRB's comments indicate that the project is going in the right direction. He said additional pre-application meetings would probably not be necessary.
- Mr. Krueger spoke about the long side of the courtyard, and said its design could provide a strong, dramatic contrasting plane compared to the variations elsewhere on the building.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the epay wood element used on the project could be used on the Juliet balconies on the interior side. The applicant said the hope was to distinguish the inside from the outside. Inside, that epay element might appear heavy. Outside, it could provide a good contrast to an overall black and white palette.
- Mr. Sutton said the epay might be an interesting choice to use on the Juliet balconies, but not the larger balconies. The applicant said he could take a look at that option again, and noted that he would also consider adding weather protection on the townhouse units on the long side of the courtyard, as the DRB suggested.
- Mr. Waggoner said the DRB would look forward to a final meeting on this project soon.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:33 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).

November 5, 2015
MINUTES APPROVED ON


RECORDING SECRETARY